AREA OR COUNTRY(S)	Approved For Rele	ase 2005/12/23 : CIA RDP83-01034R	OO A SHRANKTA HER- 1	DOCUMENT				
НО	CIA	History		DATE: 1946				
	ORE	NSA 102 (e)		thru				
	ONE	Intel dissemination		1953				
	CIG	Organization		ł				
X1	CRS*	Intel estimates		CLASS.: S				
• •				NO.1				
IDENTIFICATION OF DOCUME		freezee, title & longth)	r A. Da alaamaa sad					
"Miscellaneous Draft," Subject: "CIA Background								
History,	HS/HC - 22							
				23. 24 V				

ABSTRACT

These drafts deal with the background history of CIA primarily the Smith period. Titles and dates of drafts: "Vandenberg Stage", 1946; "1946-1950 period; "CIA Experience Before Establishment of O/NE," 1946-1950; "Main Steps in Development of ORE", 1947-1950, "The Merger of the Staff and Current Intelligence Groups," 1949; "Defense Project, (Report for Mr. Darling by GSJ)," 1946-1950; "Development of CRS-ORE," Feb. 1946-July 1947; "Developments During 1948," 1948; "Background 1946-1953," 1946-1953; "Functions," 1946-1950; "CIA Production of Estimates and Related Intelligence," 1946-1952; "Historical Staff Interviews," 1950-1953; "The Central Intelligence Group Idea," undated; "Thesis," undated; "Comment on NSA 102 (e) "Dissemination," undated Förefield 2005/12/23 ndated P83-01034R000200020001-7

*Central Reports Staff

CEADET

Approved For Release 2005/12/23 : CIA-RDP83-01034R000200020001-7

GST 1956

LIST OF CHAPTERS AS NOW PLANNED

[1950-53 hoters]

I	Evolution	of	the	Organization	Inherited	by	General	Smith

- II The Organizational Changes of 1950-1951
- III Organization for the Coordination of Intelligence Activities
- IV Organization for the Correlation and Evaluation of Intelligence Relating to the National Security
- V Domestic Collection and Related Services of Common Concern
- VI Scientific Intelligence
- VII Current Intelligence as an Expanded Service of Common Concern
- VIII Collection and Dissemination -- an Agency Service, a Service of Common Concern, and a Central Intelligence Function
- IX Central Research Activities -- the Office of Research and Reports
- X Offices of the Central Intelligence Agency

approved for Estated themes the HISTORICAL REVIEW PROGRAW of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Date 6/25/9/

me 89-2

This is a TEMPORARY DOCUMENT only, for the use of DCI/HS.
The record copy has been released to National Archives under the HISTORICAL REVIEW PROGRAM.

Date 6/25/91 HRP 89-2

нѕ/нс-24

2,00002

Next 2 Page(s) In Document Exempt

whis document has been

the sister of the release through the sister of the sister

the Central Intelligence Agency.

Date 6/25/9/

COMMENT ON NSA 102 (e) "DISSEMINATION"

G.S. Julean ?

(Note: This comment was discussed on November 17, 1955, with L. R. Houston, CTA General Counsel, who considered it a reasonable and brief statement of the case.)

The National Security Act of 1947 put a positive duty on CIA to disseminate to appropriate agencies within the Government correlated and evaluated intelligence relating to the national security. This is specific and positive and is the direct result of the Pearl Harbor investigation which showed that failure to disseminate intelligence was among the causes of the disaster. Related to this duty is the clause (section 102 (e)) allowing for inspection of the intelligence agencies by the DCI; plus the provision (d-4) that CIA shall perform "services of common concern".

In order to direct a system under which there would be a minimum possibility of non-dissemination such as occurred at Pearl Harbor, the DCI would need to take full advantage of the "inspection" clause because otherwise he would have no way of knowing whether or not material requiring dissemination had been received in any given department. He would also need whatever authority might be granted by the NSC to assure that such material would be disseminated to all appropriate officials. On the other hand, to provide for dissemination of intelligence as a "service of common concern", he would need only to construct machinery, within the central agency, adequate for the purpose of routing information.

The ideal of centrally assurred dissemination is in conflict with certain realities of intelligence. Information classifiable

нѕ/нс-24

3486488

This is a TEMPORARY DOCUMENT only, for the use of DCI/HS.

The record copy has been released to National Archives

20004

Approved For Release 2005/18/2918 PORTONE REVIEW PROCESSION 20001-7

Date 4/25/9/ HRP 89-3

Approved For Release 2005/12/23: CIA-RDP83-01034R000200020001-7

as intelligence by general standards, may be deemed unavailable for intelligence purposes by a department of the government in which intelligence is only a supporting function for broader purposes. Thus the business of the Department of Defense is to prosecute and be prepared for war, while that of the Department of State is to formulate and execute foreign policy. Information directly related to these purposes may constitute intelligence under given definitions of the term but is not so considered by these departments which will, therefore, not free it for distribution in intelligence channels. If this principle were disturbed through insistence upon a prescribed distribution of such materials, the implications for the operating departments would be most difficult.

Perhaps in consequence of these facts, the adoption of a central dissemination system such as may have been intended by Congress under the terms of the National Security Act has never been found feasible. Instead, the actual responsibility for dissemination has devolved upon the Intelligence Advisory Council (subject of course to the NSC) where ultimate decisions as to dissemination are made.

PROBLEM !

A "service of common concern" with respect to dissemination became a function of the Office of Collection and Dissemination of CIA which served both as a distribution center within CIA and a central clearing house for the routing of intelligence within the government.

This document has been approved for release through Approved For Release 2001/2002/2014 Approved For Release 2001/2002/2004 Approved For R

957

THESIS

Date 6/25/91

T HRP 89-2

The story of Central I telligence is generally told in terms of conflict in which there are villains and heroes. Donovan is seen as a great man outmaneuvered by little politicians (or as a too ambitious would-be dictator whose removal from the scene was a victory for Right) Vandenberg charges fearlessly into the ranks of the enemy and achieves a xixixxx temporary victory (or Vandenberg was an impulsive ariman whose misguided efforts were providentially cubbed.) Hallenkoetter was an able Director whose impulse was to make a workable CIA, but he was knifed in the back by self-seekers. (or Hillenkoetter was a bumbling idiot whose ineptness brought Central INtelli ence to the brink of disaster.) Smith was Superman who flew to the scene of disaster and achieved immediate triumph by the use of his magic cape (or Smith, as the representative of the cutthroats, weilded the knife.)

All this, whatever in it may be true or false, seems irrelevant. It is true that CIA was born of conflict, that that conflict has mean not been resloved, and that quite possibly it never will be. But the conflict is not important. Instea of giving it such attention, it might pay to look at the achievements that have taken place apart from or in spite of the conflict.

The conflict arose bacause the decision was not made as to whether to create

HS/HC- 24

200005

Approved For Release 2005/12/23 : CIA-RDP83-01034R000200020001-7

a Central Intelligence A^Gency or not to create a Central Ibtelligence A^Gency. The first agreement—that of ^January 22, 1946—did not do so. It authorized a co-ordinating Group which is quite a different thing. Subsequently, however, development took place that had the effect of superimposing a Central I^Ntelligence A_gency on the Group and on the intelligence structure of which it was a part.

It was at this point that the Dir ctor's role became dual. He was still
Director of Central Intelligence—the appointed coordinator of the government intelligence structure—but he had become Director of an A ency also. But this
Agency was not a Central Intelligence A ency except in name. It was rather the
apparatus through which the Director performed certain of his legal functions.

Possession of this apparatus made the Director more nearly independent of the
established intelligence structure than he could otherwise have been. But it did
not make him wholly independent nor did it give him any direct control over the
established structure.

This may and may not have been an unfortunate situation. Thezdagneexofzeze
Conflict was unavoibable. The extent depended on the outlook and actions of the
Director

The true measure of Central I telligence, however, is not in the conflict and

■

Approved For Release 2005/12/23 : CIA-RDP83-01034R000200020001-7

its consequences. A better measure is in a comparison of US intelligence before, during, and after the war.

	Вє	eßgr	·e	the	war.	the	US	could	not	pretend	to	have	an	intelligence	servic	е,
					,					-				-		ILLEGIB
centr	al	or	ot	her	wise.											
															II	_LEGIB

The war quickly proved the fallacy in such a stituation. Responsibility for Pear Harbor is not the point; there is no proof that the Pearl Harbor disaster would not have happened if the intelligence system had been stronger. What was shown was that the sort of intelligence system then in effect, there was no defense against a Pear Harbor. Whatever may have been right, what was was wrong. The progress of the war further proved the weakness of pre-war intelligence. Maps and basic in-

Approved For Release 2005/12/23: CIA-RDP83-01034R000200020001-7

for air bombardment, when it became organized, was not avzilable. Whatever the faults or virtues of OSS, it, or something like it, had to be immproved. Many of its weaknesses were obviously a consequence of its improvisation. There is no telling how much greater those weaknesses might have been if OSS had not need the advantage of British experience. OWI became an quasi-intelligence as well as a propaganda agency, collecting foreign information from membarands foreign newspapers and broadcasts. The end of the war found numerous agencies independently collecting and exploiting the i telligence left in its wake in the form of such enterprises as document acquixition, bomb surveys, and interrogations.

Spesimel.